REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 119, 132, and 133 have been amended; and claims 122-126 and 137-138 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 119 and 132 have been amended to recite that the substance is a growth hormone, low molecular weight heparin, or a dopamine receptor agonist. Support for the recitation can be found, for example, at paragraph 50, lines 4, 6, and 10-11. Claim 119 has been further amended to recite that the improved systemic absorption is obtained relative to absorption upon injecting the substance subcutaneously for purposes of clarity. Claim 132 has also been amended to recite a substance in place of a drug for purposes of clarity. Claim 133 has been amended to recite microneedle, catheter needle, and injection needle in the singular for purposes of clarity. No new matter has been added.

After entry of the amendment, claims 119-121, 127-136, and 139-142 will be pending.

THE PENDING CLAIMS ARE DRAWN TO AN ELECTED GROUP

In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that Applicant's reply filed June 18, 2007 was not fully responsive to the Office Action mailed April 18, 2007 because claims 119-142 as submitted in the amendment dated January 31, 2007 were directed to an invention that is independent and distinct from the invention originally claimed. The Examiner maintained that the subject matter of claims 119-142 as submitted was previously subject to a restriction requirement, and was not elected. Based on that contention, the Examiner has withdrawn claims 119-142 as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

In response, Applicants have amended claims 119 and 132 to recite that the substance is a growth hormone, low molecular weight heparin, or a dopamine receptor agonist. Applicants have canceled claims 122-126 and 137-138 drawn to substances to the non-elected group. Applicants submit that the claims are drawn to the elected claim group, *i.e.*, Group V, drawn to a method of injecting growth hormone, heparin, or dopamine receptor agonist into the dermis to obtain systemic absorption.[1]

[1] Group V was identified in the Restriction Requirement issued September 29, 2004. Applicants, in their response filed December 23, 2004, provisionally elected, with traverse, to prosecute the claims of Group VII (claims 99-118), drawn to methods of administering a substance to the dermis to achieve improved systemic absorption as compared to bolus subcutaneous administration. In their response , Applicants also argued that the subject matter of the claims of Groups IV, V, and VII merited examination in a single application, and

Furthermore, by amending the claims in view of the restriction requirement, Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications directed to subject matter in any of the remaining, unelected claim Groups.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the remarks made herein. Withdrawal of all rejections, and an allowance is earnestly sought. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted, by Jacqueline Benn
Reg No. 43,492

Date: October 18, 2007

Laura A. Coruzzi 30,742
Laura A. Coruzzi (Reg. No.)

JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017-6702
(212) 326-3939

Enclosure

(continued...)

submitted that a search and examination of such groups would not be a serious burden on the Examiner. *See* pages 13-14 of Applicants' response. In addition, Applicants elected the species drawn to heparin for examination on the merits.. In the Office Action issued March 25, 2005, the Examiner subsequently modified the Requirement and concluded that the claims identified in Groups IV, V, and VII were all directed to a method of injecting a substance intradermally, and thus merited examination in a single application.